DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 046 SP 038 329

AUTHOR Gray, John
TITLE A Collaborative Model for the Supervision of Student Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1999-02-27
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington, DC, February 24-27, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Collegiality; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; *Practicum Supervision; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

The collaborative model represents a different approach to the preparation and placement of student teachers at Wilmington College, Delaware, beginning with the spring term of 1997. The collaboration establishes five-member student teaching cohorts and teams of trained supervisors. It encourages the development of a collegial, community-of-support environment within and among the supervisory teams and student teacher cohorts. It involves both student teachers and supervising teachers in preparation programs and seminars. It changes the role of the cooperating teacher to that of a supervising teacher and promotes increased prestige, program ownership, authority, and accountability for that position. The project changes the role of the college supervisor to that of a college-school advisor/consultant whose primary role is to promote public school reform and renewal. The project changes the financial relationship between the college and participating schools, triples traditional funding levels, and provides direct financial support for instructional programs at partner school sites. Two appendixes contain a paper with an interim evaluation report by Wilmington College on the project and a paper from a 1998 planning session (Contains 27 references.) (Author/SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 046

A Colla
borative Model for the Supervision of Student Teaching

A FIPSE Project
Wilmington College
Division of Education

John Gray
Wilmington
New Castle College
DE

February, 1
99

SP038325

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Gray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

United States Department of Education

Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE)

Project Title: Collaborative Supervision of Student Teachers

Abstract

The collaborative model represents a different approach to the preparation and placement of student teachers at Wilmington College, beginning with the spring term, 1997. It establishes five-member student teaching cohorts and teams of trained supervising teachers. It encourages the development of a collegial, community-of-support environment within and among the supervisory teams and student teacher cohorts. It involves both student teachers and supervising teachers in preparation programs and seminars. It changes the role of the cooperating teacher to that of a supervising teacher, and promotes increased prestige, program ownership, authority and accountability for that position. The project changes the role of the college supervisor to that of a college-school advisor/consultant whose primary role is to promote public school reform and renewal. The project changes the financial relationship between the college and participating schools, triples traditional funding levels, and provides direct financial support for instructional programs at partner school sites.

* [More information about the model can be found in the F.I.P.S.E. (Fund to Improve Post Secondary Education) final grant proposal #P116B 60237, Collaborative Supervision of Student Teachers (Gray, 1996, pp. 7-15). The project is also described in the 1996, 1997 and 1998 editions of the FIPSE Program Book: Project Descriptions, U.S. Office of Education; in the U.S. Office of Education document, FIPSE Project Abstracts (September, 1996); and on the web at http://www.ed.gov/prog_info/FIPSE.]

Background

There is a widely held notion among educators that student teaching is the most important component, the sine qua non, of preservice professional preparation (Andrews, 1964; Conant, 1963; Griffin, et. al., 1983; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Lortie 1975; Wood, 1989; Zeichner, 1978). There is a significant evidence, however, that points to several critical and common flaws of traditional student teaching programs. Critics have argued since the late 1970's that:

- student teaching can have negative as well as positive consequences for prospective teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Zeichner, 1985).
- student teaching often creates decrements in attitude and in teaching behavior compared with the starting position of students prior to their field experience (Evertson, 1983).
- student teaching tends to narrow rather than expand the range of instructional strategies teachers feel they can employ (Evertson, 1983).
- student teaching may retard the development of analytic skills and may militate against the development of the profession (Berliner, 1985; Theis-Sprinthall, 1986).
- student teachers tend to receive exposure primarily to situation-specific teaching strategies rather than to options from which they might select appropriate modes of instruction (Joyce & Clift, 1984).
- Student teaching may have little impact on teachers' development of pedagogical skills or reflective abilities (Hoover, O'Shea & Carroll, 1988).

- while training for cooperating teachers has been shown to improve the studen
  t
  teaching process, few programs actually provide opportunities for such traini
  g.
  college supervisors of student teachers are poorly paid, poorly trained (if trai
  ed
  at all), seldom evaluated, and have the lowest status of any education faculty.
  Supervisors are often retired teachers or principals, non-teaching adjunct fac
  lty
  or graduate assistants with little or no involvement in departmental policy ma
  king,
  and with little or no interest in supervision as a scholarly field of study. For
  example, few doctoral students serving as student teaching supervisors comp
  ete a
  dissertation in this area (Bowman, 1978).
- college supervisors of student teachers tend to have little influence upon the
  achievement of student teachers (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Calderhead, 198
  3;
  Karmos & Jacko, 1977, Richardson-Koehler, 1988).
- there are few instances where clear criteria exist for the selection of coopera
  ing
  teachers. The process is often a matter of political or instructional expedien
  y
  (Bowman, 1978).
- many studies of cooperating teachers have found the role of cooperating tea
  hers
  to be poorly defined and found that cooperating teachers are generally unpre
  pared
  for the task of student teaching supervision (Grimmet & Retzlaff, 1986).
- cooperating teachers typically receive minimal payments and/or benefits fo
  their
  services, and there are few instances where the colleges provide any form o
  direct financial support for instructional programs at student teacher placem
  ent
  sites (Bowman, 1978).

- the impact of the cooperating teachers on student teachers ~~tends to~~ can be negative and miseducative (Theis-Sprinthall, 1986).
- close contact of student teachers with cooperating teachers may prevent the development of reflective inquiry skills (Zahorik, 1988; Dewey, 1904).

In one of the most comprehensive studies of student teaching ever conducted, Griffin, et. al. (1983) found that

- little change occurs in student teachers as a result of their involvement in student teaching.
- support participants such as supervising teachers and university superiors have often proven to be inadequate in terms of helping student teachers understand performance standards for professional practice.
- participants usually lack an awareness of policies, expectations, purposes, and desirable practices involved in the student teaching experience.
- student teachers usually receive minimal exposure to any sort of integrated instruction linking their coursework to the actual student teaching situation either substantively or ideologically.
- few instances exist of demonstrated policy, practice, or personal linkages between the university and the public school settings.
- student teacher participants are typically isolated from other participants.
- an absence of public and enforced standards of performance contribute to the fact that few student teachers are ever deemed to be less than satisfactory.

An extensive review of the research on student teaching conducted at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, by Evertson, Hawley & Zlotnik (1983) produced the following conclusion: "The existing research ... provides little reason to believe that supervised practical experience, in itself and as it is encountered in most student teaching situations, is a very effective way to educate teachers" (p. 33).

Wood (1989, p.2) argues that "except for changes in the amount of time in student teaching - generally increased, often by state mandate - and the placement in public schools rather than laboratory schools, student teaching has not changed noticeably in the last 75 years."

Goodlad (1990, p. 119) states, "The placement of a neophyte in a single classroom with a single cooperating teacher - the conventional way of handling student teaching - is a seriously flawed approach." Goodlad (1994, p. 281) also suggests that "a first step is to secure agreement within (and without, with those still exercising authority) to phase out another convention: the placement of student teachers individually with cooperating teachers scattered about in schools. Our study of a sample of teacher-preparing settings produced no argument for continuing that present practice."

However, Baker (1994) argues that reform efforts such as those proposed by Goodlad and others will fall short because they do not alter the current governance of teacher education. She believes that efforts described as collaborations are no more than exercises in polite listening. She argues that they still maintain traditional, top-down bureaucratic structures, replete with state mandated, misguided, regulatory intrusions. She feels that *decisions that shape teacher education need to be made by those who work*

closely with pre-service teachers. That, she believes, is when real collaboration and accountability (and real change) will occur.

The issue was clearly framed by Gary Griffin (1986) who, as director of the Research in Teacher Education Program (RITE) of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin wrote:

> Collaboration is an oft-used and ill-understood term, particularly in relation to matters of teaching and schooling. Too often, collaboration is a label applied to what can at best be called co-optation, the act of convincing teachers that they are true partners when, in fact, they are unwittingly doing another's bidding. There are few true examples of collaboration in educational settings, whether they be students in classroom groups or teachers and administrators working together in the same school.
>
> Collaboration, however, is central to the RITE framework of clinical teacher education because of its power for strengthening a professional development effort, particularly for career teachers, as well as for increasing the professional dignity of the participants. *Collaboration is related to ownership*. The teacher who has had some hand in formulating and carrying forward the effort (as opposed to being only the recipient of a set of externally -imposed specifications) will very probably feel a strong investment in bringing it to successful operation. Also, and perhaps more importantly, teacher education programs for new and experienced teachers are aptly concerned with giving participants more authority in their teaching roles.

Altho
ıgh the role of the "expert" is not to be downgraded, isn't it reasonable to assume t
ıat teachers, as they grow in knowledge and experience, will have greater insights
nto the issues that need to be dealt with than those who are not teachers? Many be
lieve that it has been too long since teachers had a significant hand in the determir
ation of their own professional destinies.

Althoug
ı many, like Griffin, believe that collaboration is an essential component of school renew
al, a useful definition in educational terms still remains illusive. Goodlad (1994) talks abc
ut authentic collaboration, calling it "near organic fusion." Schlechty and Whitford (1988
) discuss the need to move from "symbiosis to fusion" and argue that collaborative ef
forts will fail unless they include "shared vision and shared problems."

The Hol
mes Group (1990) established four principles for collaboration, one of which was the c
oncept of reciprocity, defined as a mutual exchange and benefit between research and pr
ıctice. Baker (1994) extends this definition, arguing that there must be mutual exchan
e, benefit, and accountability between key actors.

Baker's
ideas are especially compelling, because she recognizes that most educational eff
ırts described as collaborations are not really collaborations at all, but tend to be forms of
olite listening. She argues persuasively that key decisions regarding teacher prepara
tion continue to be made by those who are far removed from the classroom. Sh
describes prevalent collaboration efforts as multiple actors consulting the traditional dec
sion-makers who maintain the decision-making powers. She reminds us that the Carne
ie Forum (1986) stressed that teachers should enjoy the same degree of autonomy as o
her professionals.

> Because their experience and judgment is respected and they alone are presumed to have it, professionals enjoy a high degree of autonomy in carrying out their work. They define the standards used to evaluate the quality of work done, they decide what standards are used to judge the qualifications of professionals in the field, and they have a major voice in deciding what program of preparation is appropriate for professionals in their field (p. 3).

It is clear that in order to move schools in a new direction - toward a family/community model - toward collegiality and collaboration, interaction, shared decision making, enhanced personal responsibility, reflection, group focus, teamwork, mutual goal setting, thinking critically and creatively, etc., several things must change. One of the first things that must change is the way we conceptualize student teaching.

An approach is needed which changes the interface between the college and the schools, the college and the cooperating teachers, and between the student and supervisor. An approach is needed which identifies, supports, enhances, and extends the work of superior teachers. An approach is needed which provides our best teachers with opportunities for recognition, professional development, leadership and reward. An approach is needed which improves the skills of both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and which provides improved learning opportunities and environments for children. An approach is needed which makes more efficient use of college supervisors's time in schools, and which enables them to help cooperating teachers become teacher educators (Borko & Mayfield, 1995). The Collaborative Model is an attempt to do just that.

The Collaborative Model: An Overview

The Wilmington College collaborative student teaching project is now nearing the end of its third year. The project, funded in 1996 by a three-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education, represents a somewhat different approach to the preparation, placement and evaluation of student teachers. The project is grounded in the conceptual framework for preservice teacher preparation at Wilmington College. That design, adapted from the RITE framework for clinical teacher education (Griffin, 1986), strives for a program that is

- context-embedded.
- context sensitive.
- purposeful.
- knowledge based and standards driven.
- developmental.
- analytic and reflective.
- collaborative.

The project strives to create an environment of authentic collaboration (Baker, 1994; Welch, 1998) characterized by

- shared vision and shared understandings.
- mutual benefit and accountability (reciprocity).
- interactive exchange of resources.
- an emphasis on interpersonal communication and conflict management.
- trust and mutual respect.
- joint ownership.
- problem solving.
- joint ownership.
- problem solving.
- shared decision making.

The project establishes 5-member student teaching cohorts and supervising teacher teams empowered to work as *equal* partners with students and college staff in designing site-specific content and structure for the preservice clinical semester. It encourages the development of an *authentically* collaborative environment within and among the supervisory teams and student teacher cohorts. It changes the role of the cooperating teacher to that of a supervising teacher/teacher educator, with increased pay, prestige, program ownership, authority and accountability. It provides the student teacher with a broader repertoire of teaching and management skills; provides greater opportunities for development of a personal teaching style; provides for increased levels of reflection, collegiality and mutual support; and provides greater exposure to the culture of the school. It shifts the focus of the college supervisor from observing and evaluating student teachers (the inspectorial approach) to a broader school context, with an emphasis on consulting and advising supervising teachers. The college supervisor becomes a conduit for new ideas, research, and resources, becomes more engaged in site-based problem solving and decision-making, and has the opportunity to become an agent for school reform. The project changes the financial relationship between the college and participating schools, triples traditional funding levels, provides graduate credit options for supervising teachers, and provides direct financial support for instructional programs at partner school sites.

The collaborative model differs from traditional student teaching models in the following ways:

- supervising teacher teams are formed from volunteers who choose to affiliate with the project following a presentation of project goals and guidelines to the total school faculty.
- student teacher volunteers are formed into teams (cohorts) of five, and matched to teams of supervising teachers in partner schools. (Students at the college have the choice to participate in a traditional student teaching arrangement, with a traditional supervisory triad, or in the collaborative model.)
- student teachers (now called interns) remain together throughout the clinical semester, even when doing two separate placements in different schools.
- interns and teachers are involved *together* in at least 15 hours of planning and preparation sessions *prior* to the beginning of student teaching (a sample agenda for one of the sessions is appended to this document).
- intern/teacher teams make critical decisions about the content and structure of the clinical experience, including planning the context and format of "solo" weeks.
- teams reach consensus on evaluation strategies.
- teams devise a plan for interns to spend 5-10 days observing and interacting with all supervising teachers.
- interns decide how to choose a primary supervisor/mentor (the home base). All interns must agree on this process and must decide how to resolve conflicts.
- interns are supervised by classroom teachers, *not* college supervisors.
- the college supervisor's primary focus shifts away from individual students and toward the supervisory team and the overall school culture.
- the college supervisor's role becomes that of helping supervising teachers become teacher educators.
- weekly, reflective seminars are held at the partner school sites and include college staff, interns and teachers.
- each seminar agenda is set by the teams, not the college or project staff.
- interns work with all five classrooms and teachers, but develop and maintain a more intensive, long-term relationship with one classroom and student group.
- interns do peer observations and critiques.
- teams devise ways for interns to gain broader exposure to the total school culture.

- interns plan and carry out a context-sensitive, collaborative, integrated, thematic unit that affects all five classrooms.
- teams devise ways for interns to work with and be supervised/evaluated by all five supervising teachers.
- interns' final performance evaluations reflect the views of all five supervising teachers.
- a monthly newsletter is prepared and distributed to all former and current project participants.
- each team receives direct, unencumbered, discretionary financial support ($1500-$2000) for instructional materials, supplies, trips, etc., for each placement. This support comes directly from college funds, *not* FIPSE program funds. Teams make all decisions about expenditure of funds, *not* the college.
- the project director facilitates (on request) the expenditure of funds by placing orders, arranging purchases of materials or services, and reimbursing teachers and interns for personal expenses. This approach enables teams to obtain materials and services more efficiently (and faster) than typical school and district purchasing procedures allow, and also allows for a wider range of choices for teachers and interns. The project has established accounts with local teaching supplies and book vendors, permitting teachers and interns to obtain teaching materials and have the costs billed directly to the college.
- each classroom teacher has the option of receiving 3 graduate credits or a stipend for the initial semester of participation. This is a one-time-only credit/stipend equivalent to $730 and is provided through FIPSE funds.
- interns prepare and submit portfolios for review by an outside portfolio review team.

Project Evaluation (in progress)

The project's evaluation consultant indicates that substantial progress is being made toward achieving project goals (the 1998 interim evaluation report is appended to this document). Participant and school reactions continue to be positive. Teachers are reporting a stronger sense of program ownership, a perception of higher status/prestige than in traditional student teaching arrangements, a better understanding of the difficulties and complexities of supervision, clearer understanding of expectations, a closer relationship with the college, a better understanding of colleagues, higher levels of confidence, lower anxiety, high levels of enthusiasm, significant impact from direct financial support, and a desire to continue participating in the project.

Interns are reporting a sense of collegiality and mutual support, less stress, a deeper understanding of school culture (especially the political climate of the school), increased confidence and a sense of being well-prepared for entry into the profession, improved decision-making ability, a preference for working collaboratively rather than in isolation, and a broader repertoire of teaching/management skills based on their experiences working with several different teacher-supervisors. The employment rate for interns completing the program has been 100%.

Some problem areas that emerged during the project included

1. an overly ambitious estimate of the number of teams that could be formed, prepared and maintained each semester.
2. an absence of existing, workable "road maps" to help facilitate problem solving, decision-making, and meaningful collaboration.

3. involu
   ntary shifts of teachers and principals due to system-wide school choice progr
   ms and/or local political pressures, causing difficulties in keeping some teams
   intact.

4. some
   difficulties in building cohesive teams in schools where team structures had not pr
   eviously existed or where school organization, philosophy and schedules milita
   ed against such an approach.

5. diffic
   lties of some participants in conceptualizing the clinical semester in ways differ
   nt from their own student teaching and/or school experiences.

6. some
   college faculty resistance toward changes in the supervisor's traditional role.

7. time
   nd personnel required to handle administrative details relating to providing direc
   financial support for instructional programs in partner schools.

Four
een different elementary, intermediate and middle schools located in five school distri
ts in northern Delaware and southeastern Pennsylvania have participated in the project t
date (involving 50 student teachers and 60 classroom teachers). At least one more su
ervisory team will be formed before the end of school year 98-99, bringing the total nun
ber of teacher and intern participants to at least 120. It is the intention of the college t
continue the collaborative approach after the grant period ends (September, 1999).

Dr. Doug Archbald, the project's evaluation consultant, will complete a final evaluation report during the summer and fall of 1999. Additional research is currently underway to look at other aspects of the project in more detail, including an examination of the nature of decisions made by the teams, how they were made, and the impact of decision-making on participants' perceptions of empowerment and ownership.

John Gray
Wilmington College
New Castle, DE
February, 1999

References

Andrews, L.O. (1964). Student teaching. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Baker, E. A. (1994, April). Restructuring pre-service education governance: Beyond collaborative efforts. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Berliner, D.C. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. 36(6), 2-8.

Bowman, N. (1978). Student teacher supervision: Practices and policies. Action in Teacher Education, 1 (1), 62-65.

Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach. Teaching and teacher education, Vol. II (5), 501-518.

Calderhead, J. (1988). The contribution of field experiences to primary teachers' professional learning. Research in education, 40, 33-49.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task force on teaching as a profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Conant, J.B. (1963). The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw Hill.

Copeland, W. (1986). The RITE framework for teacher education: Pre-service applications. In J. Hoffman and S. Edwards (Eds.). Reality and reform in teacher education (pp. 25-44). New York: McGraw Hill.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C. A. McMurray (Ed.), Third yearbook of the national society for the scientific study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1984). The characteristics of effective teacher education preparation programs: A review of the research. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook on teaching and policy (pp. 150-170).

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Better teachers for our nation's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72 (3), 184-194.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Limited.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., Jr., O'Neal, B., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & H H. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptivukill, study. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for e Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. A. (1986) Clinical teacher education. In J. Hoffman & S. Edwards (Eds. Reality and reform in teacher education (pp. 1-24). New York: Random Hou. se.

Grimmett, P. P., & Retzlaff, H. C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teache Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (6), 41-50. role.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In Houston (Ed.) Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 514-534). NW. R. York: MacMillan. w

Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hoover, N. L., O'Shea, L. J., & Carroll, R. G. (1988). The supervisor-intern relatio and effective interpersonal communication skills. Journal of teacher educatiship (2), 22-27. n, 39

Joyce, B., & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher. 13 (4), 5-18.

Karmos, A. H., & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the stu teaching experience. Journal of teacher education, 28 (5), 51-55. dent

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The Univers Chicago Press. ty of

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student tea A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (2), 28-34. ching:

Theis-Sprinthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training: A worl model. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (6), 13-20. ing

Welch, M. (1998). Collaboration, staying on the bandwagon. Journal of Teacher Education, 49 (1), 26-37.

Wood, L. H., (1989, August). Maximizing the development of student teachers du student teaching. Paper presented at the summer workshop of the Associaring Teacher Educators, Tacoma, WA. on of

Appendix A

INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT FOR WILMINGTON COLLEGE FIPSE PROJECT: THE COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

WILMINGTON COLLEGE
DIVISION OF EDUCATION
FIPSE PROJECT

Director: John C. Gray

Prepared by: Doug Archbald
Department of Educational Development
University of Delaware
June, 1998

Introduction

A central theme in many leading school improvement initiatives is professional collaboration (Barth, 1990). It is well documented that the organizational structure and culture of most public schools do not encourage collaboration, and in fact, can make collaborative work exceedingly difficult. Top-down decision making, curriculum compartmentalization, and the isolation of the self-contained classroom are among the forces militating against professional collaboration in schools. Research has also shown norms among teachers that work against the development of more collaborative school cultures. Although such norms are in part the result of the organizational structure of schools, part of what sustains non-collaborative cultures is that teachers go into the profession guided by images of the self-contained classroom. This image is developed during their experience as a student, and remains largely unchanged by their teacher education experience in college. Teacher education programs consist almost entirely of curriculum, teaching methods, and subject matter courses, and a practicum where the student teacher is placed in the classroom of a practicing teacher. Student teachers have virtually no instruction or experience concerning issues of governance, collaboration, or decision making processes. Student teachers are not instructed in or placed in situations where they have to think about their role as a member of an organization, as a colleague, or a decision maker. Ironically, most leading reform initiatives require exactly these kinds of roles and frequently flounder because teachers, and sometimes principals and other school-level decision makers, are not able to perform theses roles effectively (Barth, 1990; Elmore and Associates, 1990).

This second year report presents the results of an evaluation study of a project at Wilmington College sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The project is called the Collaborative Supervision of Student Teachers. In this approach, college faculty, elementary school teachers, and interns (student teachers) work in teams. A key premise of this project is that collaboration is important – that practicing teachers should have more opportunities to work collaboratively, that student teachers can benefit from a team approach to their practicum experience, and that both practicing and student teachers should have more ownership over the practicum experience. If reforms advocating school-based management, shared decision making, teacher empowerment, curriculum integration, and team-teaching are to succeed, then teachers will need more preservice and inservice opportunities to practice the attitudes, skills, and tasks of collaboration.

This report suggests that the collaborative practicum model is an effective approach to develop attitudes and skills helpful for working in teams. The collaborative practicum model exposes intern and practicing teachers to a wider diversity of teaching styles and organizational experiences than would otherwise be possible in the traditional single-intern/single-teacher model. The interviews with the participants in this collaborative student teaching project focused on goals and issues related to the collaborative aspects of this project. Broadly stated, these were some of the main questions: Through what mechanisms or processes was collaboration achieved? How did

participants view the benefits of collaboration? What were obstacles to collaboration?

The Project's Theoretical Framework: Collaboration and Teacher Empowerment

Many of the major reforms of today assume teachers should have a greater role in running their school and should spend more time with each other involved in planning, problem solving, and research (Elmore and Associates, 1990; Maeroff, 1993). These reforms advocate a shift from the present role of the teacher with its isolation from governance and limited authority, to a role that has more control over resources and school governance. "Empowerment" is sometimes used to refer to this role shift. Hand in hand with empowerment is collaboration. It is assumed that teachers exercising more empowered roles will do so collaboratively. The idea is not, for instance, to replace a principal with a teacher, or to give individual teachers more freedom to act in isolation in traditional roles, but for teachers *to exercise more power collaboratively* in planning and decision making. Collaboration presupposes heightened authority and expanded decision making roles.

Reforms envisioning more empowered and collaborative teachers are predicated on two key rationales. The first rationale is tied to a long held tenet of the human relations school of organizational theory: that heightened employee control over work increases employees' job satisfaction and sense of responsibility for results (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; McGregor, 1960). Since the 70s, growing state and federal control over education and district consolidation has lead to a centralization of decision making in education (Walberg, 1994). The result is shrinking discretion and power for building-level educators concerning professional development, teacher evaluation, curriculum materials and methods, budgeting, and student affairs (Frymier, 1987; McNeil, 1986; Peterson, 1984; Wise, 1988).

Thus, there has been a growing inconsistency between teachers' professional training and credentials and their typically limited discretion on the job. Teacher education has become more sophisticated, and more teachers than ever are seeking advanced training and degrees; yet on the job there is isolation and minimal involvement in decision making. Reformers argue empowerment and collaborative decision making are antidotes to the "deprofessionalization" and "deskilling" resulting from centralized control policies (Duke, 1988; Lieberman, 1988).

The second rationale, improved delivery of instruction, builds on the first. Proponents of empowerment and collaboration contend that school-level decision makers are in the best position to make effective decisions. Weiss (1993:69), for instance, has written: "Advocates claim the shared decision making will yield better policies. Because teachers have detailed, variegated knowledge about students and curriculum, decisions in which they participate will be grounded in intimate understanding of context -- and will thus be wiser." It is believed fuller use should be made of the knowledge and ideas of teachers to tailor decision making, curriculum, and instruction to local school and community priorities. This does not mean merely inviting input from teachers about how

to improve curric
teacher involvemelum, instruction, or school management; it means, rather, making
teacher educationnt in these matters an expected part of their job. For this to happen,

A leading will need to change.
empowerment anreform initiative, school-based management, illustrates one model of
Although there isl collaboration and shows how they are interdependent concepts.
primary control ono single model for Site-based management, a common model places
parents, and the per the school in a "school leadership council" on which sit teachers,
school district is rincipal, often with teachers the majority constituent. The Chicago
governance polic prime example of this approach. In the early 90s, a dramatic change in
to a leadership cc was implemented which shifted substantial powers to the school level,
In the Chicago scuncil consisting of the principal, elected parents, and a teacher majority.
setting authority.hools, the leadership council is the school's decision making and policy
authority to hire Its powers cover major areas of school functioning, including the
aspects of schoolnd fire the principal. Teachers are now instrumental in governing many
student affairs. Efunctioning, including curriculum, budgeting, personnel issues, and
schools, but the lvaluations of this reform indicate that it has worked well in many
participating in sack of training and experience among teachers and parents for
(Bryk et al., 199ared governance has proved to be a major obstacle to greater success
as well (Harrisio). This finding has come up in other studies of Site-based management

Other ref, et al., 1989; Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995).
(a.k.a., ITI) alsorms, such as "school restructuring" and "integrated thematic instruction"
these reforms foenvision teachers in more empowered and collaborative roles, although
require that teaclus less directly on governance. Reforms that restructure the curriculum
These reforms reers initiate, implement, and evaluate curriculum on a schoolwide level.
integrated curricquire that teachers work together to develop common standards,
curriculum to loolum units, and mutually reinforcing instructional methods and to tailor
preparation, resal needs and resources. It is assumed teachers will have sufficient

urces, and authority to undertake these changes.

The Need:
Training for Empowerment and Collaboration

The imp
schools makes artance of achieving greater teacher empowerment and collaboration in
Wood, 1989). strong case for improved training aimed at these goals (Goodlad, 1994;
and reflect on thuch training would need to expand teachers' perspective to learn about
to teach group eir role in an organization and a *program* of instruction and it would need
accomplished. rocess and collaborative skills. There are a number of ways this can be
emphasizing pri his report describes a project that restructures the practicum experience,

Since thciples of empowerment and collaboration.
it has the potent practicum is a big commitment for both the mentor and student teacher,
and practicing tial to be a powerful learning experience in ways beyond simply observing
changes in scho delivery of lessons. It is ironic that reformers call for organizational

ols that require shifting authority to school-based teams and collaborative

work, and yet these issues are absent from the vast majority of practicum programs. In a typical practicum experience, a student teacher is placed with a mentor teacher for anywhere from about 9 to 18 weeks. The student's university supervisor usually requires the student to develop and teach a set of lessons or units; and the student teaches the lessons or units after a set period of observing and helping in the classroom. Usually the student's evaluation is done by the university supervisor with some input from the mentor teacher. This arrangement has sufficed for more than seventy-five years (Wood, 1989). The traditional practicum generally presents the teacher as a lone practitioner, responsible solely for his/her classroom, and not concerned with issues outside the classroom. It reinforces the perspective that becoming a teacher is mainly learning how to manage a classroom and deliver effective lessons.

From perspectives emphasizing teacher empowerment and collaboration, the traditional practicum is inadequate. It is too hierarchical and insular. Compared with the traditional model, the collaborative model increases the mentor teachers' control over the practicum process and requires more collaboration among the mentor teachers. The collaborative model also changes the student teacher's role. It require observations and participation in multiple classrooms and more time conversing among themselves and with teachers about teaching and the practicum experience. The intent of the collaborative model is to improve the quality and effectiveness of the practicum experience, and to produce longer term empowerment and professional development, both for the student and the mentor teachers.

Description of The Collaborative Model

The collaborative practicum model establishes five-member student teaching teams and places them as a group in schools where they are supervised by a team of teachers. This differs in substantial ways from the traditional model where the college-based supervisor is in charge, placing students in the classrooms of "cooperating" teachers, creating assignments for students to carry out, and grading the student teachers in the end. The collaborative model changes the role of the cooperating teacher to that of a supervising teacher, with increased pay, prestige, program ownership, authority and accountability. The supervising teachers work as partners with college staff designing the content and structure of the preservice clinical experience. According to the project director, this model "encourages the development of an "authentically collaborative environment within and among the supervisory teams and student teacher cohorts...It further shifts the focus of the college supervisor from observing and evaluating student teachers to a broader school context, with an emphasis on consulting and advising supervising teachers." A key principle of the project's philosophy is that the school-based teams -- the teachers working with the interns -- decide how to structure the practicum experience. Because of this there is much variety in the practicum programs that developed in the participating schools.

The process, in a nutshell, works like this: The project director meets with the administrators and teachers of a school to describe the collaborative practicum model and

to invite the participation of a group of teachers. A precondition for a school's involvement is that a *group* of teachers are interested in participating and are committed to the collaborative model.

This is an important step because it is desirable that the group of teachers are not only interested in collaborative relationships, but are also effective mentors for the student teachers. The project director stressed the importance of this step, and a certain tradeoff: The college-based supervisor trades off some control over selection of participants in the interest of the goal of developing an empowered, collaborative teacher team, but teachers gain ownership and responsibility for the process. In key respects, this process of deciding to participate as a team is a first step in implementing the principle of "program ownership, authority and accountability" among the teacher teams. It would contradict the principle of empowerment for the project director to decide "who is in and who is not." Fortunately, however, a useful form of self-selection takes place: teachers disinterested in collaboration or threatened by this arrangement do not volunteer. In all likelihood, they would be less desirable mentors anyway. This does not mean that the teacher teams are always 100% compatible and trouble-free, but the self-selection process is a decidedly favorable influence. When the teacher teams are established in the schools (to this point seven schools have received student placements), the teams of student teachers (interns) are placed in the schools.

The duration of the placement is generally twelve to fifteen weeks although it can vary depending upon school schedules and other factors. Basically, the interns spend an entire semester, full-time in a school. The general pattern is for the interns and the teachers to meet several times as a group to get to know each other and to do initial planning. This planning is for scheduling initial classroom observations. Then the interns engage in a series of classroom visits and observations with each of the individual teachers. The purpose of this is to observe each teacher in preparation for the next step: the interns, based on discussions and their observations of the teachers, select one teacher to be their individual "primary placement." The primary placement is necessary because it gives the intern a "home-base" classroom and a primary teacher responsible for the intern.

There are several rationales for the interns selecting the teacher for their primary placement, rather, than say the college supervisor doing this or the selection process being random. First, it is an important decision and having the interns make it, based on discussion among themselves and with the supervising teachers, gives them experience with and responsibility for making a serious decision. This is part of what the program is all about. Second, it is desirable for interns to match up with a primary placement teacher they are compatible with and whose classroom and teaching style is consistent with their own professional objectives. For instance, if a teacher's classroom has a large number of special education students (the "inclusion" concept) and an intern is likely to be in this situation for his/her first teaching position, then this teacher would be a good choice for the intern. As another example, an intern may want broader exposure to a particular teaching method or management style she/he witnessed in a particular classroom, and thus make a selection accordingly.

The next broad phase involves planning and scheduling the interns' rotations among the classrooms of the teacher teams and their curriculum. This, of course, is

neither a discrete nor single, one-step process. It involves a great deal of ongoing discussion and planning. Planning and implementing intern visits to multiple classrooms is a significant challenge because of such factors as different lunch periods among the teachers; different "specials" or prep periods; periodic school events; unplanned events and activities; and different teachers being at different points in their curriculum. The general pattern was for the interns to spend most of their time in the classroom of their primary supervising teacher (observing and teaching), but a large fraction of their time observing in the classrooms of the other teachers on the team, teaching in the classrooms of the other teachers on the team, observing their fellow interns teaching, planning and debriefing meetings with the teacher teams and Wilmington College faculty, and developing units and discussing teaching with the other interns.

A key component of the experience for the interns was the development of an integrated thematic unit. Whereas the traditional single-intern/single-teacher model often has the intern developing and teaching his/her "own" set of lessons, a key principle of the collaborative practicum is the collaborative development of an integrated thematic unit. As described earlier, leading education reformers and thinkers like Goodlad, Sizer, and Gardner stress the importance of an integrated curriculum developed and taught collaboratively, but interns rarely experience this. As part of the collaborative practicum, the interns had to do the following: Using the state curriculum frameworks as a guide to determine appropriate topics and learning goals, they had to develop an approximately one-month unit of instruction that would be an integrated unit. The unit would consist of separate three to five day lessons that the individual interns would be responsible for. Thus, each intern had to develop his/her own subunit of the larger integrated, thematic unit. Each intern had to teach his/her subunit (approximately three to five days worth of lessons) in each of the classrooms of the participating teachers. The interns' units had to be sequentially integrated, so from the perspective of the elementary school children in the classroom, the units from the different interns were coherent (i.e., integrated). Accomplishing this took a great deal of planning and collaboration.

Evaluation of the interns was carried out by the teacher teams. The teacher teams were responsible for deciding how this would be done. The typical approach was for the primary placement teacher to manage the evaluation of his/her intern. The teachers selected the evaluation rubric developed by Wilmington college teacher education faculty as the approach they wanted to use. The primary placement teachers provided ongoing informal feedback to their interns and to the other interns whom they observed, and conducted formal written mid-term and final evaluations for their interns. In conducting their formal evaluation of their intern, the primary teachers usually elicited feedback from the other members of their teacher team. Thus, the evaluations were group oriented in the sense that the teachers as a group had observed and knew all the members of the intern team, and generally had items of feedback to share.

Data From Interviews Conducted With Supervising Teachers and Interns

Introduction

The results of the interviews with the teachers and interns will be presented at a project level, not at the level of individual schools. While the conclusions and recommendations that follow do not necessarily derive from or apply to each of the participating schools, they are nonetheless applicable to all to varying degrees.

The interview process focused on a few key topics and began with the supervising teachers and the interns being asked to describe in general terms the practicum arrangement at their school. Then, discussion proceeded toward a variety of topics concerning the challenges and benefits of collaboration, teacher leadership, and student teaching associated with the nontraditional organization and relationships of the collaborative practicum. Like any new program, new tasks of communication, coordination, and role change are encountered and must be resolved. The interview process was intended to shed light on these new challenges, what went well, and how things might be improved for the third year of the project.

There is strong support among the teachers and interns for the collaborative practicum project and anticipation for next year. The teachers and interns understand the goals of the collaborative practicum model and the overall consensus was that this project was important and worthwhile. Each of the goals of the project -- creating collaborative teams, giving interns exposure to more teachers and teaching methods, giving school-based teams more control over supervision, enhancing the quantity and quality of reflection and feedback -- was achieved to some degree. Without a doubt, compared to the traditional models with its limited emphasis on collaboration the FIPSE project has brought about significant changes. Of course, as there always is with organizational change, there were gaps between initial expectations or goals and the practices and processes that actually occurred in implementation. These remain the challenges to resolve and opportunities to learn as the project continues.

The following presents findings and interview results on key aspects of the collaborative practicum experience. Interviews were conducted with samples of teachers and interns from each of the participating schools. Interview excerpts are indented, and labeled "T" for teacher, "I" for intern. My questions/comments are in square brackets, italicized.

Observing Different Teachers and Teaching Styles: The "Rotating Internship"

The collaborative practicum model is designed to give student teaching interns exposure to multiple teachers in their teaching placements. Because the supervising teachers were organized as teams at the schools, it was possible for each of the interns to spend time in each of the teachers' classrooms. There is no question that compared to the traditional "one teacher - one intern" model, the interns as a whole had significantly more exposure to more classrooms, teachers, and methods. The experiences among the interns varied, since each school designed its own practicum, but all of the interns spent

considerable time in other classrooms in addition to their primary placement and some observed and taught in as many as five other classrooms.

> *[Comparing and contrasting the collaborative model, what do you see as the strengths and the disadvantages of this model as opposed to the alternative?]* T: Well I think the strengths are definitely - the primary strength - I see is that it provides you with an opportunity to see many different teaching styles within the same grade level, you know so that variable is the same. So you see children of this age and you see same kind of content being delivered in different ways. So I think that is really advantageous. That's where you get to see the art and craft of teaching. It lets the interns have the opportunity to pick and choose strengths that they see instead of just identifying with one particular cooperating teacher as a role model and assuming those kinds of behaviors are how its done, you know, you're better able to getting information and try things on your own to find out what works. I think that is the largest strength.
>
> I: I like the opportunity to see different kids in different classrooms. You get to see the way different teachers teach the curriculum and manage their classrooms. In a way it's a bit like substituting which can really be a challenge. You go in and if you've never been with a teacher before, you know they have their own rules and you learn that you have to fit with those, but also establish your own rules, so, for instance, you may have to say to the kids, "When I want your attention I'm going to ring this bell, and so when the bell rings... heads up." That kind of thing. *[You have to be able to come in and hit the ground running so to speak...]* Exactly.
>
> I: It was helpful because you see different teaching styles, management techniques. You just pick up ideas. It was most helpful in language arts where teachers do a lot of different things. It was less helpful in math because most teachers teach it the same way. One teacher was a sort of a "school marm" type, sort of more traditional -- a pretty strong disciplinarian, and another was sort of more friendly and warm, and I felt like I could see the ways each worked and how I thought each one had pluses and minuses. It was really helpful.

Another teacher, while supportive of the concept, expressed reservations about the pacing of the lessons delivered and attributed this at least in part to the students rotating through the classrooms. In her opinion she was concerned that if a student does not spend enough time in the same classroom, it is harder to get to know the students at a level that reveals individual students' interests, personalities, strengths, and needs. She felt, that some of the delivery of lessons in her class were a bit rushed, and that several of the students would have done better if perhaps they had been in her class longer and she had more time to work with them and they had more time to get to know her students. On the other hand she acknowledged that the students had been successful in getting to know more students as a whole, throughout the school, than they would have had they been

more isolated in one classroom

> T: I must say this with respect to the interns - they did an outstanding job of making themselves present to all of the children in the grade level. Of introducing themselves of being highly visible so that in fact they weren't like strangers popping into the room when they did their unit or their spot...*[So it wasn't like the first time the students had seen them when they delivered their unit...]* Exactly. [*How - how do they do that?*] Through observing the classrooms. They spent a couple of weeks observing different teaching styles and observing in the rooms and, of course, by assuming and participating in non teaching responsibilities - lunch duty, recess duty, field trips, those kinds of things being present in assemblies, different programs that we're doing ... just being there. And so they really, you know, made their presence known.

The only disadvantage teachers described with the rotation approach is that students spend a shorter period of time in their primary classroom. Disadvantages mentioned include not getting to know the students as well, which has implications for understanding in more depth the learning or behavioral progress of individual children, and not having as much time to see the continuity among sequences of units. The reduced time in the primary classroom, of course, is an inevitable consequence of observing in multiple classrooms, unless the length of the practicum is increased. Otherwise, the more time spent in multiple classrooms unavoidably means less time in any one classroom.

The important challenge -- not a simple one -- is determining the optimal balance of time in the primary classroom and time rotating among classrooms. In theory there is a point of diminishing returns in the time spent in one classroom, assuming there is the option of observing and teaching in other classrooms. Ideally, an intern would be in a primary classroom long enough to experience the kind of continuity and connections with children that only sustained contact can bring, but still have enough time to observe and teach in at least several other classrooms. This project in its final report will have data to shed light on this question.

On The Collaborative Tasks and Relationships

In the collaborative practicum model, more planning and decision-making devolves to the supervising teacher and intern teams. This includes planning and scheduling the rotations of interns among the different classrooms, planning and coordinating the interns' teaching experiences, and discussing and conducting the interns' evaluations. In interviews I asked both the teachers and the interns to describe these processes and what they thought of the group interactions and collaborations in relation to the goals of the practicum.

> [*The interns have to do a fair amount of planning together. Do you think this is helpful?*] T: I think one thing that really modeled what happens on the job was that the student teachers were put in situations where they too had to resolve some conflicts among their group ....They discovered there were varying teaching styles

and l
that ivels of preparedness among them when they went into the classroom and
but f affected them in different ways. Not only discussing things with teachers
comr them working as a team, I think they found out some of the importance of
you lunication skills...and tolerance that's necessary to work with each other in,
with now, collaborative efforts. [*What would be an example... like having to deal*
acce omebody who saw things differently in the classroom and just kind of
the c*ting it?*] Right. There was a situation where there were two interns within
extr assroom who had extremely different styles of teaching... And not only two
being nely different styles of teaching, but different approaches to planning and
...an prepared. [*In what sense?*] I think in the degree of preparedness and how -
tensi the kinds of things that you would consider and I think that caused some
the on, especially with the person who felt like she was being taken over. That
ther her person was taking more charge. Also, there was a problem ... one of
To g was much more creative...and the other was much more of a traditionalist.
safe) off on a creative tangent or to pick up on the teachable moment was not a
not one for the traditionalist intern and that really caused some tension. *[It was*
kno*fe in what respect?*] There just wasn't a comfort level. But then again, you
was, that could be individual concerns. [*So the difference in the interns was one*
teac more directive and traditional and the other more open style, creative
to w*ing?*] But they're put in a position where they had to resolve that - they had
thin rk with it...You know, this is part of life and we talked about some of these
eacl s as a group about what it means. You know, we're faced with this - with
eac other. And then just by listening to our discourse of how we might teach
diff other as teachers. They find that, you know, you learn to appreciate
insu ences and not think that one's better or best or one should be taken as an
or an inferior method. They're just different.

[*Th*
You *practicum model requires more coordination... how does that work?*] T:
the know that in a sense it forces people to sort of plan and coordinate because
with rogram requires it. [*Does that have some benefits because interns get to talk*
thei the teachers in real group decision-making types of settings? Does it open
see, *eyes to that aspect of life in the schools?*] Absolutely. Then they're able to
play you know, exchange of ideas among teachers - seasoned teachers. As far as
hea ing and, you know, and just how the personalities mix. [*I imagine that*
thai ing what teachers have to say and picking things up in these discussions --
defi *wouldn't happen if the intern just got planted in the classroom...*] Right, it's
itely an advantage. Definitely.

T: I
lev think this model really helped to bond the interns well with the whole grade
It r. It wasn't like, "Oh that's the new so and so student teacher, you know."
pla ally bonded them with the whole grade level ... made them really involved in
lev ning things on a team level. As a result of being really involved at the team
knd it kind of carried over to the building level... And within the building, you
w, they were identifying with whole building. Typically it seems to be one

student teacher, but here you had a team of them...*[So in a sense the group of interns belonged to like the building?]* Right. *[It's not so much one teacher saying, "that's my intern?"]* Right...it definitely feels like a building level.

[*How well did the team concept work for you?*] I: I've talked with some other student interns [*not in the collaborative practicum project*] and one of the things that just keeps popping up is that they were really scared their first week, because they didn't really know anybody and they didn't really have a support system, whereas I was with this group, and I knew them. [*How does that support work?*] Those of us that had planning periods at the same time, we spent our planning periods together. We always managed to gravitate to each other... in the mornings, we had recess duty together, we had lunch, sometimes we spent time on the weekends working together. Actually we spent several weekends working together when we had a unit that we created together.

It is noteworthy that the collaboration extended into curriculum development activities by the interns. That this process implements principles of cooperative learning theory is an important outcome of the collaborative practicum model.

I: The unit was a three week social studies unit on Colonial America. We had develop the unit to cover the four strands from the state curriculum frameworks -- Civics, Geography, History, and Economics. So we each took a chunk of that. We had five days during each placement to teach our social studies unit. We were to do it during our solo week. So we each took a daily lesson out of that and planned it and then we first taught the lessons to each other. We would go over our own lesson, what we had developed, and teach it to the other four members, so they could go on and in turn teach it in the classroom. Each of us was doing that for each of the others. So we each taught our own lesson and we taught each of the other students' lessons. *[When would you do this teaching to each other?]* Over the weekend... we spent a lot of time with each other (laughs).

[*Would you give each other feedback? You know... this was clear, and this was not clear...*] Oh yes, absolutely. We felt very comfortable. [*So you endorse this team-like concept?*] Absolutely, 100%, I can't imagine doing it any other way.

Group problem solving is an important feature of the collaborative practicum model. As described in the theoretical framework earlier, there is little doubt that interns will be better off to the extent that group interaction and human relations experiences are part of their preservice education. Teachers work in organizations, not as individual practitioners. While they may teach in some isolation in classrooms, they spend a good part of their life in meetings and committees, and make many decisions involving and affecting groups of people. A large body of research demonstrates that organizations' effectiveness is heavily dependent upon peoples' ability to communicate effectively.

The collaborative practicum model depends greatly on group interaction. In the

weekly meetings, the project leaders encouraged the supervising teachers and interns to reflect on their experiences and discuss issues as they arose. On instance where group problem solving was important involved a conflict that arose between an intern and a parent. An elementary student with behavioral problems was acting out and being disrespectful. The intern lost patience and in the heat of the moment used some strong words with the student. The child told the parent, the parent contacted the school and the intern soon realized that s/he was about to have his/her first tense meeting with an upset parent.

This problem came up for discussion in one of the group meetings. The teachers listened to the intern's side of the story and concerns. They helped the intern gain perspective on the problem, talking about why some students behave as they do and helping the intern to understand the situation from the parent's perspective. They also helped the intern understand his/her own contributions to the problem and how in the future the problem could be avoided. They also helped the intern prepare for the meeting with the parent, explaining how s/he should avoid defensiveness, accept responsibility for wrongdoing, and be clear and straightforward about his/her side of the story.

There can be little doubt that this emerged as an important learning experience for the intern. The intern was able to draw on the many experiences of the group of teachers, develop insights into the situation that s/he otherwise would not have had, and derive moral support from the group.

Finally, it should be noted that the teachers benefit from the group interaction too. Several teachers talked of how after many years in the classroom stagnation can be a problem. The opportunity to talk with other teachers and the interns on a regular basis brings exposure to new ideas, offers intellectual stimulation, and emotional renewal. Studies have borne out these teachers' observations. Organizational cultures can over time become stale and static. People lose energy; there is less talk about challenges and improvement and more complaining, idle conversation, and killing time. It appears that at least in some of the schools the teachers' participation in the collaborative practicum has been an intellectual recharging process.

Some Issues

Choosing the teachers. Part of the practicum model is for the interns to choose their primary placement teacher after having the opportunity to observe all the teachers. The rationale for this was described earlier. Some of the supervising teachers, while they understand the rationale and see advantages, are not fully convinced of the effectiveness of this practice.

> T: I think there should have been instead of this free choice of teachers, more like, "This is it. These are the classrooms you have been assigned here - here are your observations." It's all so important for you to see different programs and different styles. If after x amount of weeks you would like to try another program if there's any wishes or changes, you know, let's bring it to table and discuss it then.

A few others echoed this sentiment, though it was not a matter of rejecting the

idea outright. There were three concerns voiced. One was that some interns, in the
of several of the teachers, were too hasty in their judgments about what would and
not be beneficial for them to experience. They were concerned that some of the inte
are not yet informed enough to know exactly what would and would not be of value
them in determining the kind of classroom environment they should experience in th
placement. Interestingly, they saw the interns' discretion to choose as potentially
compromising the value of fully experiencing multiple classroom environments.

The second issue was that the process made some teachers uncomfortable.
source of the discomfort was the potential of being judged negatively or not being
by the interns as a desirable placement.

The third issue was that the choosing process was a source of some disagree
among the interns. Simple mathematics dictates that if there are X number of teach
the same number of interns, and more than one intern wants to be with the same tea
there will tension. The decision of who gets what teacher and classroom is a big de
for the interns. They greatly value their internship experience, want it to be a good
and want it to be with the right (in their view) teacher and classroom. To resolve th
problem, some intern groups resorted to a "picking out of a hat" approach or devel
systems to select teachers in a way that combined preferences with a random draw
process. The interns understood the rationale for choosing the teachers and also fo
making the decisions collaboratively among their group, but the process was noneth
difficult.

Time consumed in coordination. The planning and coordination time requir
implement the collaborative practicum is significant. Most of the teachers mentione
spontaneously during the interviews. Although the time requirements can be expec
diminish as the college supervisors and teachers gain experience with the process, a
point it still is more time consuming than the traditional model placing a single stud
with a single teacher. Teachers estimated about four hours a week going into the
practicum.

Part of the time issue was a sense that the weekly meetings could be used m
productively. Some teachers and interns felt that some of these meetings did not
accomplish enough and lacked focus. In particular it was felt that the meetings ear
the semester were more important and valuable than those later in the semester whe
and routines had become more solidified. Suggestions included clearer agendas, re
the frequency or length of meetings when possible, or using meetings later in the se
for specific forms of preparation for the job-seeking process.

Role-shift apprehensions. There remains some ambivalence among the sup
teachers about acquiring more responsibility for the interns' education (such things
determining interns' tasks, schedules, and grades). As just described, part of the is
time. But different from the issue of time is what might be viewed as apprehensive
about new dimensions of their role as supervising teacher. Some, in fact, acknowl
certain advantages of the traditional model, of having someone else oversee lesson
planning and evaluation. Evaluation, in particular, is a lot of responsibility.

In addition, the traditional model in some ways offers the supervising teach
of a "buddy" like relationship with the intern. In the collaborative practicum mode

teachers assume greater responsibility for assignments, timelines, and evaluations. While this is part of the model, it is a different role for some teachers, and not all teachers are equally favorably disposed or prepared to exercise greater responsibility and authority.

Finally, some teachers commented on the practicum model's fluid structure. Again, while this is an inevitable outcome of more decentralized group-based decision-making, for some teachers it creates a sense of a lack of structure and uniformity which takes some teachers outside their "comfort zone."

All of these are normal issues of the change process.

Concluding Comments

Empowerment is a phenomenon with a paradoxical element. Not all teachers are equally disposed toward the goals of empowerment. Learning new tasks, roles, and relationships requires effort and brings uncertainty. Sometimes it takes the prodding of leadership to urge people down the path of empowerment. The Wilmington College FIPSE project is providing this leadership and helping create opportunities and support for teachers and interns to adopt new roles and relationships. Like any new venture, there are challenges along the way. Overall, though, it is impressive to see the many people involved willing to take risks and try new things and to see the level of effort "above and beyond the call of duty" put into planning, discussion, decision-making, modeling, and learning -- all for the purpose of improving the education of new cohorts of teachers.

The main year three recommendation is to draw on the lessons and best practices of the first two years. A useful product would be to develop a kind of "planning and implementation kit." It might begin with a list of all the decisions that need to be made and the tasks that need to be done in implementing the internship program at each school. Developing such a list would be productive group task involving participants. The packet (report, brochure) could contain, among other things, such items as a recommended protocol for the process of choosing teachers, a template for collaboratively developing and scheduling the delivery of a curriculum unit, alternative evaluation rubrics, and other guides and prescriptions for the practicum teams. Such a product would make a nice contributions to the FIPSE "lessons learned" series.

Reference List

Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryk, T. et al. (1997). Academic productivity of Chicago schools. Chicago: Chicago Consortium for School Research.

Duke, D. (1988). Why principals consider quitting. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(4), 308-313.

Elmore, R. & Associates (1990). Restructuring schools: The next generation of education reform. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Goodlad, J. (1994). Access to knowledge: The continuing agenda for our nation's schools. New York : College Entrance Examination Board.

Harrison, C.R., Killion, J.P., & Mitchell, J.E. (1989). Site-Based Management: The Realities of Implementation. Educational Leadership, 46 (8), May, 55-58.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.) (1988). Building a professional culture in schools. NY: Teachers College Press.

Locke, E. & Schweiger, D. (1979). Partipation in decision-making: One more look. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), Research in organizational behavior (pp.265-339). Greenwich, CT:JAI.

Odden, E.R,. & Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Making School-Based Management Work. Educational Leadership, February, 32-36.

Maeroff, G.I. (1993). Building Teams to Rebuild Schools. Phi Delta Kappan, March, 512-519.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. NY:McGraw Hill.

McNeil, L. (1986). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Peterson, K. (1984). Mechanisms of administrative control over managers in educational organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, December, 573-597.

Walberg, H. (1994). Losing local control of education: cost and quality implications. Network News and Views, 13 (1), January, 1-20.

Weiss, C. & Cambone, J. (1994). Principals, shared decision making, and school reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16 (3), Fall, 287-301.

Wise, A. E. (1988). The two conflicting trends in school reform: Legislated learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 328-332.

Appendix B

Wilmington College
Division of Education

FIPSE Project: Collaborative Supervision of Student Teachers

Pleasantville Team, Fall-98

Second Planning Session: June 12, 1998

Workshop Objectives:

To review the project's basic assumptions and objectives.

To share understandings gained from prior team experiences.

To clarify administrative procedures for reimbursement, credit options, and instructional support.

To begin to work toward a sense of "community," shared understandings, mutual purposes and support.

To define and agree on expectations for supervising teachers, student interns and college staff.

To clarify and agree on roles of supervising teachers, student interns, and college staff.

To reach tentative agreements on program specifics such as schedules, assignments, requirements, evaluation procedures, seminar timing/structure, etc..

To review the Delaware Standards for Teachers and discuss them in the context of Collaborative Model and expectations for interns.

To explore team views regarding priorities and learning outcomes.

Some Basic Questions We Need to Answer:

- How will initial intern assignments be made (grade levels, teachers, etc.)?
- How can interns be made to feel that they are an important part of the total school community?
- Will there be an "observation/orientation" period, and if so, how should it be organized?
- How will interns be able to spend meaningful time in all classrooms?
- How should "solo" teaching be organized?
- How will all supervising teachers manage to observe and critique all interns?
- How will input? Amid-term and final evaluations be organized so that all participants have meaningful re standard forms adequate?
- How will weekly seminars be organized and structured?
- What other kinds of school-culture experiences should interns have?
- What about requirements and format for reflective journals, daily/weekly/long term plans?
- How can supervisiweekly, scheduled times be set aside for individual conferencing between interns and ng teachers? Should interns assume responsibility for arranging such conferences?
- Will a co organizellaborative, integrated, thematic unit be required, and if so, how should it be l, implemented and evaluated?
- How mig philosopht the team best deal with conflicts (teaching-management style, personality, ıy), disagreements, and failures to meet expectations?
- What ab in schoout expectations in terms of intern dress, behavior, attitude, punctuality, participation wide activities, etc.?
- What are invited t the expectations for interns regarding preparations for school opening? Are interns inservice sessions, staff workshops, faculty meetings, etc.?
- Do boun furniturdaries need to be established in terms of student alterations of classroom environment, arrangement, management approaches, curriculum, content, schedules, etc.?
- What ab after scbut intern involvement in parent conferences, staff meetings, inservice workshops, associatool activities, disciplinary hearings, special education review sessions, on/union meetings and activities, etc.?